

FAIR PLAY IS A JEWEL:

OR, THE
LANGUAGE AND CONDUCT
OF THE
DISCUSSERS' DISCUSSED;

In which
THE CASE IS FAIRLY STATED
Respecting the
BISHOP OF SALISBURY'S LATE CHARGE,
And
MR. WANSEY'S LETTER:

THE
Illiberal Charges brought against the Clergy
ARE REPELLED;

AND
THE PRETENSIONS OF SOME, AMONG DISSENTERS, TO EX-
CLUSIVE WISDOM AND CHARITY,
ARE EXAMINED:

Occasioned by a PAMPHLET, entitled
"RIGHTS OF DISCUSSION."

BY A BY-STANDER.

Cerdon next advanc'd
Of all his race the VALIANT'ST:
Cerdon, the Great, renown'd in song,
LIKE HERC'LES, FOR REPAIR OF WRONG:
Faith friend he was to reformation;
* * * * *

Next RECTIFIER of WRY LAW,
And would make *three*, to cure *one* flaw:
But PREACHING was his chiefest talent,
Or ARGUMENT, in which being VALIANT,
He us'd to lay about and fickle,
Like ram, or bull, at CONVENTICLE.

HUDIBRAS.

Salisbury:

Printed and Sold by J. EASTON: Sold also by J. HATCHARD, 173, Piccadilly,
and F. and C. RIVINGTON, St. Paul's Church-Yard, London; T. BAKER,
Southampton; and R. CRUTTWELL, Bath. 1799.

[Price One Shilling and Sixpence.]

FAIR PLAY, IS A JEWELL:

LANGUAGE AND CONDUCT

DISCUSSERS, DISCUSSED

THE CASE IS STATED

BY THE EDITOR OF THE LONDON JOURNAL

MR. HANLEY, LONDON

THE LONDON JOURNAL, LONDON



BY

FAIR PLAY IS A JEWEL.

WHEN I first cast my eyes over part of the Pamphlet entitled the "*Rights of Discussion*," I was so much pleased with the candour, openness, and liberality of some passages, that I immediately gave up all idea of saying a word upon the subject; but upon looking into the Introduction, and examining some parts of the Publication more attentively, I found such justly offensive matter; such intolerant, uncandid, and unchristian expressions; that claiming, with the Authors of that Pamphlet, an equal right of Discussion, I feel it a duty as a Christian and a man, to *discuss* in my turn *their* peculiar pretensions

B

tensions to candour, and to expose the flippancy and malignity of several of their remarks.

In the first place from the Title of the Book one might be led to suppose that the persons against whom it is levelled, had been *fulminating* their *anathema's* against all fair and candid discussion. But how is this proved? Who has *denied* the rights of a fair and candid discussion? Will any man deny to the Church of England the exercise of the same *Rights* which he claims himself? It appears to me this is the case in the present instance. Let us fairly state the point at issue, such at least as it appears to my plain understanding, and if I should appear wilfully to misinterpret, I should be first to acknowledge my error. Let us endeavour impartially to consider the case according to my Title, a homely one I confess, but by no means improper, *Fair Play is a Jewel*.

Mr. Wansey in the first place writes an insolent and abusive Letter concerning the *supposed* language of intolerance used towards the Dissenters. He therefore attacks the venerable Bishop of Salisbury, from a vague account of
his

his late Charge in the newspaper, without pretending to have heard a word himself of the obnoxious accusation, only upon the *assumed* idea that what was said was intolerant, uncandid, and injurious to the general character of the Dissenters. I shall not enquire whether he felt in his own breast, a consciousness of their *deserving* any *blame*; or whether he might judge of the feelings of other men by his own: be it as it may, he thought himself it seems, called upon to come before the public to repel a visionary attack, and made use of the occasion to throw out the most false and scurrilous invectives against the whole body of the Clergy of the Church of England. Very well. If Mr. Wansey has a right to discuss in *such a manner* an unprinted Charge, will any one say that the Clergy have not an equal right to *discuss* Mr. Wansey's *Discussion*, if *he was abusive*; in *plain English*, to pay him in his own coin?

Mr. Wansey has been completely foiled and exposed; and as he now prudently seems to have retired into the back ground, certain Champions have advanced in his cause, or the "cause of truth," as they call it themselves. They have

set up the banner of defiance, as if their high mightynesses had been attacked by an host of Barbarians. They have enjoyed their imaginary victory, and in conclusion, solemnly seated in the magisterial chair, have voted themselves a petty directory over the state of religion and politics, gravely condescending, indeed, to point out the most proper subjects for a Bishop's Charge, but at the same time thundering out their denunciations of vengeance, against bigotry and intolerance, whilst, with a narrower bigotry, they trample upon tolerance themselves, and upon the very Rights of Discussion which they pretend to uphold.

These charges I undertake to prove. I shall premise an observation or two in general, and shall add such further remarks as may incidentally occur.

When I saw in the papers week after week, the intended publication announced, and understanding that it was the joint effort of a party, I naturally concluded, that if there were any thing which could be fairly urged in favor of Mr. Wansey's conduct, if any thing could be brought home

home to the Clergy, concerning those general crimes, which he weakly and impudently laid to their charge, I should find it in that work; and I was prepared to consider all circumstances with the dispassionate feelings of a man, who only sought to know the truth, and nothing but the truth. After long waiting for the united and vast effort which struck my imagination, as if the fate of the Church of Salisbury, the existence of the Bishop, Canons, Minor-Canons, and Singing Boys, depended on it; which seemed to announce *fortunam Priami cantato et nobile bellum*: upon its appearance I could scarce help saying to myself, *quid tanto dignum feret hic promissor biatu!* I found indeed the most material points of the Controversy given up; Mr. Wansey's illiberality acknowledged; and a respectable character both for learning and candour, freely and liberally allowed to the Clergy. This indeed was so different from Mr. Wansey's dirty and indiscriminate abuse, that I considered at first the Authors of the "*Rights of Discussion*," though I differed from them in many things, as open, ingenuous, and manly opponents.

It

It remains for me, and I sincerely regret the task, to point out where they have deviated from this character, and if I should say any thing which they might not quite relish, they must remember the example they have set. Earnestly do I wish that both parties would endeavour to "follow after" that charity, "which is not puffed up," and to cultivate that mutual benevolence, which is so necessary in a world of *imperfection and sorrow*.

OF THE

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

RIGHTS OF DISCUSSION.

The Author, though he seems fully satisfied of himself, of his own amazing prowess, yet, before he puts out his whole strength, generously expresses a tender concern for the occasion, and even shews a sort of struggling reluctance to exercise his Herculean powers.

“I would not,” says he, *“have put my foot over the threshold of the Augean Stable of Controversy, if the Rights of Controversy had not been called in question by the Bishop.”* He, great and generous hero, would not have interfered, unless paramount duty had obliged him. Will he excuse me if I tell him, that upon this occasion he puts me not quite so much in mind of the great hero of antiquity, as of the Dog in Gay’s Fables.

Like

Like him, possibly, considering the parties as quarrelling for a bone;

Away he scours, and lays about him,
Resolv'd *no fray shall be without him.*

But let us hear him.—He would not have interfered, “ unless the Rights of Controversy “ had been called in question by the Bishop.”

Now I say, *negatur major*,—I deny the proposition, and he ought to have *proved* the truth of it, before he commenced his Draw-cancer expedition. I defy him, Mr. Wansey, or any one in the world, to *prove* that the Bishop called in question the Rights of Controversy.

He adds, with as much humility as candour,
“ *I cannot suffer a war-hoop to be raised against*
“ *so truly valuable a body of men as the Dissenters,*
“ *nor spirits as bigotted as Laud, as furious as*
“ *Sacheverel, to cry, ‘ Havoc, and let slip the*
“ *dogs of war,’ without unfurling the banner of*
“ *reason, and asserting the imprescriptible, unali-*
“ *enable, and universal Rights of Discussion, in*
“ *matters of conscience.*”—To which I answer,
first, that in *matters of conscience*, no one inter-
feres,

feres.—Who is there in this country that does not enjoy the fullest liberty of conscience? but if there are those who, *not contented* with enjoying this liberty of conscience themselves, think they have a right to interfere with the consciences of others, they are the men most to blame. The ground is here shifted from the Clergy denying the Rights of Discussion, *which they do not*, to their dictating in *matters of conscience, which they do not*, nor ever can, according to our laws, *even if they wished it*. The ground of the argument is *shifted*, and the assumption, in both instances, is false.

Let me remember the example of Him who “reviled not again,” whilst I transcribe from the page of a publication, professing candour, these words; which I do with reluctance and sorrow, more than with resentment. The Clergy are charged “*with setting up a war-hoop against*” “*Dissenters, and spirits as bigotted as Laud, and*” “*as furious as Sacheverel, crying, ‘Havoc, and*” “*letting slip the dogs of war.*”

Whoever thou art, who hast coolly written this, I would ask, “Dost thou profess thyself
“ a Chris-

“a Christian; I might almost say,—art thou a
 “man?” Thou knowest the Charge is *not true*,
 thou hast acknowledged in other parts of thy
 book, that the Clergy of the Church of England
 are enlightened and *liberal*, more so than any
 sect since the first ages of Christianity! Who
 has raised a war-hoop? Has the meek and vene-
 rable Bishop? Have any among his Clergy? If
 they have, I will not defend them. But do you
 mean here, in contradiction to what you have al-
 lowed in another place, to charge the whole body
 of Clergy as bigotted, furious, and alone the ene-
 mies of peace and mercy? In this respect, I am
 sure they are “more *sinned against*, than sinning;”
 and I know of no “*war-hoop*” so loud or so
 furious as Dr. Priestley’s, “the Clergy deserve
 “no mercy!” Unless the *war-hoop* of the pre-
 sent Pamphlet may be compared to it. I say
 to thee, if thou dost profess thyself a Christian,
 if thine heart be made “of penetrable stuff,”
 consider when thou lyest on thy bed of rest,
 whether thou hast not done *cruel* and *malicious*
wrong to thy *brother*; and at that moment I
 would whisper, “Why observest thou the mote
 “which is in thy brother’s eye, and heedest not
 “the beam which is in thine own eye.” I
 hurl

hurl back the accusation, but I trust without indignation; and I assert, if there are furious zealous and bigots, they are more likely to be found among those, who imagine the world cannot go right unless their wisdom directs it, and who would sweep away every thing which clashes with their own narrow and uncharitable creed!

But let us hear a little more of

“Erc’les’ vein.”——*Hamlet.*

“*Had I the strength of a Sampson to pull down
“the Temple of this modern Dagon, and to bring
“to the ground the strongly rooted pillars of pre-
“judice and intolerance, I should think my fate
“glorious to be buried in its ruins!”*”

Mercy upon us, how you talk, Mr. Lingo.—
The immortal Baftwich,* who only lost his

* The Author, I believe, of a book, in the time of Charles I. called *Vox Borealis*; the following is a specimen of its toleration and humanity:—“There is a time, when Babylon must down, and the
“Bishops, who are but whelps of that whore’s litter, must down
“before her; and why may not the time be now? all the policy
“that I have, can never possess me of any possibility of bringing
“peace and safety, except the *bloody and undermining locusts* be sent
“to the *bottomless pit*, from whence they came.”

ears

ears in the same glorious cause, might give you, if he were alive, the hand of fellowship:

“ Give me thy hand, Bully-monster,
“ I begin to have bloody thoughts.”

Tempest.

For myself, I should like to know what is the meaning of the Temple of Dagon. Do the *Clergy in general* worship there so constantly? Or only Mr. Malham, and the anonymous writers in the present controversy, with that wicked Man of Metre, who was so illiberal, as to turn into a *Cantilena*, Wansey's precious prose? If the Temple of Dagon means the Temple of Intolerance, are there none among the meek Dissenters, who sometimes sily go to worship there also?

If we could be *certain*, that the Temple in which *you* worship, was in reality “ the Temple “ of Truth,” your zeal against the “ Temple “ of Dagon,” would be very commendable: but as we cannot be certain that YOU only among all mankind, worship the Truth, and as we have *only your own word* for it, we hope you will spare yourself, this time, the trial of so vast an exploit, and go quietly about your *business*,

business, without running your head “against the wall,” and attempting to acquire the honour of so glorious an exit.

CHAP. I.

States the present Controversy to have arisen from the Bishop charging the Dissenting Preachers with DELUDING the people.—I deny plainly that the Bishop never called them DELUDERS; but if he had, he would have said no more than was true. He only said, there were so many Meeting-houses registered, and he called upon the Clergy to be attentive to their parochial duties, in order to counteract, as much as possible, any unfavourable impressions, which the numerous Preachers among Dissenters might excite to their disadvantage. That many of the Dissenting Preachers have done so, and continue to do, I can prove; and it would have been candid in the Bishop to call such conduct by so mild a name as *deluding*. I can prove, that the tendency of many Discourses from Dissenting Pulpits has been to stir up the people to disaffection to the laws,

laws, and to hatred of the Clergy of the establishment.

I have heard in the city of Bath, before a crowded audience, at a respectable chapel, a Preacher of celebrity among them say in a Sermon these words, and I will bring witnesses to the truth, upon oath, if called on:—" *Now let us look at the Clergy of the establishment, the Parsons, as they are called:—I came down, Brethren, from London in the Mail Coach, and there was in company one of those Parsons, who was like the rest of his tribe. You may be sure he did nothing but swear all the way—talk blasphemy, and indecently to the ladies, and was so drunk before he came to his journey's end, that he could not stand when he got out of the coach.*" Now is it not deluding the people to charge upon a whole body of respectable men, in a place of worship, such conduct as was described in this Sermon? Is it not worse than *delusion*? And must not the charge, as a general charge, be founded on rancour, envy, or a most diabolical wish to malign, for a most diabolical purpose, the Clergy of the establishment. I have by me in print many *Sermons*, chiefly in the
same

same strain, delivered to numerous Dissenting congregations in London. If a Clergyman so far forgets his station, his duty, and his character, as to deserve, in any way, such accusations, it is proper that the Bishop admonish him to set a better example; and if a Preacher among the Dissenters makes all the use he can of whatever might be wrong in a Clergyman's conduct, to excite disgust and hatred against that whole class, Candour herself might justly call him a deluder. The Clergy of the Church of England are, in general, most respectable, and in retired situations do much good. Take fifty parishes, and where will you find a notorious character, such as Dissenters often represent them *all* to be.

If I were to charge the Dissenters in general with such designs, I should be guilty of the conduct I reprobate. Among them are men eminently distinguished for learning, piety, peaceableness, and charity. The names of a Barbault, a Dodridge, &c. will be remembered, as among the best teachers, and the best examples of Christian benevolence, and real goodness. Mr. Kingbury has taken some part in the present controversy.

verfy. I do not know him; but I am convinced,
 from his writings, that he is a fincere and
 good man. I am fure he would not have pub-
 licly denied that the Clergy were reviled in
 Diffenting Pulpits, if he had been himfelf
 capable of fuch conduct, or if he thought any
 one elfe could; but I can prove to Mr. Kings-
 bury, from undeniable documents, the afperity,
 mifrepresentations, and grofs abuse, which
 diftinguifh very often Diffenting Difcourfes.
 I do not mean to fpeak of respectable Diffent-
 ing Minifters, but of the ranters, enthufiafts,
 who do much mischief in the country. The
 Bifhop, therefore, did right, if he warned
 his Clergy to do all they could to prevent the
 loweft orders of the people from being deluded.
 With refpect to the political creed of thefe en-
 thufiafts, and connection between them and le-
 vellers and republicans, I fay nothing at prefent.
 This is a true and fair ftatement; and the Bifhop
 need not *difown* it, if he had called the Diffenters
 deluders; but I deny that he did. If his Lord-
 fhip urged the danger of innovation, and the
 falfe philosophy of the times, whilft at the fame
 time he expreffed a “*faint hope that none but re-
 ligious and the pureft motives influenced the per-
 sons*

"*sons alluded to*," he spoke as a Christian and good man. The "probable consequences" may be easily conceived from the harangues of Dr. Priestley, the fine descriptions of VENGEANCE in our modern Theo-philanthropic Poets, and the charitable insinuations of the Authors of the present Pamphlet. Indeed, the *abettors* of liberty, and the *lovers of peace*, seldom express the "faintest hope" that they who support the establishment may be actuated by *pure motives*! So far charity is against them.

The conclusion of this chapter is, that the "*friends of truth*" have reason to rejoice; and as the admirers of Thomas Payne drank the health of Mr. Burke, with thanks for the discussion he excited; so these "*friends of truth*" have, they think, reason to drink the Bishop's health for exciting a discussion in which they flatter themselves they have proved so eminently and manifestly victorious. As to their being "the friends of truth," if they assume that name to themselves alone, I deny it. If they had been so, they would not have shewn, as they have done, in the passages I have quoted, a zeal more intolerant, and a bigotry more narrow,

c

than

than any they have charged upon Priests; for proof of which, I refer to the passages. As to their imaginary triumph, it appears to me that no men have less reason to triumph, for the greatest part of Wansey's Charges have been given up; nor do they attempt to answer a book called *A Rowland for an Oliver*, which they acknowledge is written with considerable abilities, and which has refuted paragraph by paragraph, all that Wansey advanced. The triumph of "*these friends of truth*," seems something like the triumph of the French Convention for the success of their fleet, when Lord Howe took eight of their ships! Or like the triumph of Falstaff, who, at the end of the battle, in which he did nothing, exclaims, "There lies "*Percy*."

This triumph, if it be any, I shall not disturb. I can even suspend, for a moment, my astonishment at their unparalleled confidence and vanity, and enjoy, in idea, almost as much as if I were of the Party, the self-congratulations, and applauses, which I dare say, they mutually bestow on each other, for their astonishing efforts, and glorious success! After cleansing the

" Augean

“Augean stable,” and ridding the earth of the monsters of superstition, I can conceive these “*friends of truth*,” resting from their glorious toil, each in his own judgment, an Hercules; and recruiting their spirits in the back parlour of *my little good-natured Friend, the Quaker*, with a glass of *his excellent English Calcavella*, whilst that incomparable Poet, Thomas Clio Rickman, entertains the company with a Song of Triumph, an *Io Pæan*, upon the occasion, made entirely out of his own head.

Quem virum aut heroa Lyrâ, vel aeri
Tibiâ fumes celebrare, Clio?

Silence, Gentlemen, for

Mr. Thomas Clio Rickman's Song.

TO THE TUNE OF DERRY DOWN.

NOW woe be to Sarum, both Ancient and New,
And woe be to surplice, and pulpit, and pew,
And woe to the Church, bloody Babylon's ark,
And woe to the Parson, Churchwarden, and Clerk.

Ca Ira, Ca, Ca, Ca Ira.

The day it is come, yea, the day it is come,
When no more Jemmy Corfe, on his organ shall strum;

C 2

When

When vengeance the Man of vile Rhymes* shall o'ertake,
And the Bard and his Bookseller† broil at one stake!

Ca Ira, &c.

The sapient Critic,‡ with spectacled nose,
And his grammar, in vain, our career shall oppose;
We'll laugh at his gerunds, in "dum," and in "do,"—
And send him to *parse* in the regions below.

Ca Ira, &c.

At Collins's shop, from the lamp, in a string,
With his Broom at his back, Parson Malham§ shall swing;
Whilst W——'s fat Dolly shall squeak out, O La,
And the Printer's black Devils all sing *Ca Ira*.

Ca Ira, &c.

So the Priests shall all swing, and the world shall *be free*,
And none be so great and *Lunatic*|| as we:
For when will the world ever boast *such* a Trio,
So *enlighten'd*, as Wansey, and Fisher, and Clio!—

Ca Ira, &c.

*Chorus of Quakers, Presbyterians, Mugglestonians, Tatterdemal-
lions, the Printer of the Salisbury Paper, his two Devils, and
Peedy-weedy, the noted chimney-sweeper.*

For when will the world ever boast *such* a Trio,
So *enlighten'd*, as Wansey, and Fisher, and Clio!—

* The Gentleman who so illiberally put into metre the Clothier's Letter.

† Poor Mr. J. Easton.

‡ The Author of *Strictures* on W.'s Letter.

§ The Author of *A Broom for the Conventicle*.

|| See *Criticism* on this word of the ingenious Poet, page 33.

CHAP.

C H A P. II.

But to proceed.—After acknowledging, in the completest manner, Wansey's illiberality, the Author of *Rights* says, that "he deserves the thanks of society, for the rectitude of his intentions; though he confesses W. has been incorrect in some respects."—I answer, that if every person after being *convicted of illiberality and falsehood* deserves the thanks of the public, for the *rectitude of his intentions*, I will not deny, that in this respect, Mr. Wansey may deserve the thanks of his country. Though I see *no truth* he has investigated, no fact that he has established, whilst he stands by the confession of enemies and friends, an impotent calumniator. I cannot justify the conduct of any men, who shun him, or "withhold from him their salutations," yet I see no particular *intolerance pressing on him*. He is amenable to discussion; but myself, as well as the Author of *Rights*, would give him the right hand of fellowship; thinking that his conduct was chiefly injudicious, and hoping after the complete *set down* he has justly received,

ceived, he will grow wiser, and not set the first example of intolerance.

The state of the question respecting him, is this; mark me well: He *assumes a point*, that the Bishop had abused, in a most intolerant manner, the Dissenters.—He assumes, from the words in the Newspaper, that the Bishop mentioned their “*deluding* the people.” I do not say but that he had a right to discuss the account, as it appeared in the Newspaper, and to defend the Dissenters, if he thought the imputation unjust. But when he goes beyond this, when he *assumes the point*, that the Bishop did, absolutely, speak with the utmost *illiberality* of the *Dissenters*; (which as he did not hear, he certainly could not prove) when under *this idea*, he asks the Bishop if he meant to make *short work* with the Dissenters; that is, if he could, whether he meant to *persecute* and *destroy* them; when he takes occasion, from the same *assumed point*, of pouring out the most atrocious and *false* calumnies, against the whole body of the Clergy, is he the fair searcher after truth? Are they, who have exposed his scurrilities, the friends of bigotry, and enemies to all fair discussion?

cussion? This is a true statement, and let the friends of the *Rights of Discussion* disprove it. I am equally a friend to discussion, but when Mr. W. with his "yelping treble," assails those who never offended him, it is proper to send him "sneaking" home; though I am sure he has only heard the smack of the satiric thong, as yet.

When the Defender of this gentleman finds he has no certain ground of argument, no fair plea of discussion, he says, he may draw the conclusion from Wansey's opponents, that the Charge "*went further than was thought adviseable to trust out of the walls of the Cathedral.*" There is nothing in what W.'s opponents say which can justify this conclusion; if they had said any thing like it, it would have been NO PROOF; and the assertion is as unfounded as it is illiberal.

The "rough" simile of W. about the Dog and the Sheep, I have no doubt, would strike every body as meant to apply to the Bishop, but surely it is too contemptible for the opponents of W. to feel "*fore at.*"

After

After a good deal of labour to prove it could not be meant personally, the Author of *Rights* says, he “has been more particular about this “*rough, but just and striking simile, as almost “all the personal scurrilities against Wansey, have “been founded on this passage.”* I know not any personal scurrility pointed at Mr. W. which he has not drawn upon himself, by *scurrilities* in the *first place*. If we give up the “Great Dog,” does not this vindicator of liberality remember the shrewd enquiry of Mr. W.; “Does your “Lordship mean to *make short work* of them, as “Daniel de Foe *hinted at?*” Is this liberal to a person whom Mr. W. states to be amiable in private life, and venerable for learning?

What follows is certainly too striking not to be taken particular notice of: “*I do not,*” says the Author of *Rights*, “*believe, that since the “first ages of Christianity, any Church ever boasted “more purity, liberality, and learning, than the “Church of England.*” This is a manly, and handsome concession; I only wonder how it is possible to reconcile it to the dreadful anathemas pronounced against a Church, by the confession even of adversaries, so pure, liberal, and

and learned. I shall not press this farther, hoping and believing, the *intolerant* passages, before taken notice of, were not written by the same person; and I should be wanting in candour, if I did not say that, what follows, whoever wrote it, speaks a fair and honourable adversary; whom, as I also am an *advocate* for discussion, and seek after truth, I should have no objection openly and plainly, and without asperity, animosity, or contention for victory, to meet on the subject.

CHAP. III.

I need not be particular in examining this Chapter, as the Author of *Rights* gives credit to the *Remarks* of Mr. Malham, admitting their general candour and good sense. One passage I notice—" *I trust the day is at hand, when Priestcraft and persecution will flee away as shadows of the night, and such discussions as the present cannot but accelerate it.*"

If the Clergy are persecuting and oppressive, I should also wish, that persecution and Priestcraft
might

might "*flee away*;" but whilst they are in general "liberal and learned," I hope the time will not hastily arrive, when they will be obliged to give place to those who *have* been "LESS TOLERANT," and of whom, if we may judge from their language, the same spirit may be expected as distinguished them in the day of their power.

I shall pass over Chapter IV. which relates to the Critical Remarks on Wansey's *language*, as neither one or the other deserve particular notice: I confine myself to what appears to me unfair and unjust in the statements of the Pamphlet; and if in smaller things I express myself with apparent levity, I hope it will be forgiven, for though I might appear intolerant to my Adversary, I can truly say, that I never knew what were the feelings of ill-nature, spleen, or resentment. I feel, indeed, indignant, when I hear the language of intolerance, persecution, or bigotry, whether from Kings, Priests, or People; whether from a Nero, or a Robespierre; a Bonner, or a Wakefield.— But my own conviction is, that as, there is no reign so bloody, as the reign of the "*Peuple Souverain*;" so there is no intolerance more furious, than the intolerance of those who think they
have

have a right to judge for the rest of the world; and having shaken off what they consider as *prejudices and superstition*, instead of pitying those who are “less enlightened,” denounce VENGEANCE against them as the friends of darkness, and the abettors of tyranny!

CHAP. V.

I now come to the Chapter relating to the Authors of *Dissenter Done Over*, and *Deplo-
rable Malady*.

“The title of *Dissenter Done Over*, is a
“*sufficient proof of the Author’s liberality.*”—
Mark, with what grace this accusation comes:—
Mr. W. commences a most unjustifiable attack
on the Clergy; he challenges discussion, by put-
ting his name to the libel: he calls them Drink-
ers, Swearers, and Mahometans; and yet “his
“*Gentleman Defender*” thinks it very grievous,
and shockingly illiberal, in a Gentleman and
Clergyman, to make use of such words as the
Dissenter Done Over. To put this stronger, let
us imagine a sort of Dialogue:—

Wansley.

Wansey. My name is Henry Wansey. Hear, all you Parsons; you are a set of notorious Hunters, Shooters, Drinkers, Swearers; you *never* do any thing else; you are Mahometans, all of you. My name is Henry Wansey!

Answer. Mr. Henry Wansey, you have taken upon you to call us all sort of names: I am a Clergyman; I think what you say is very unjust; and in return, Mr. Henry Wansey, you will give me leave to call you—

W. To call me!—Good God! what can you call me?—Do I drink?—

A. I do not say you do.

W. Do I swear?—

A. I cannot say I ever heard you.

W. What then can you say I am?—

A. Why to tell you the truth, Mr. Wansey, you are—a Dissenter—*done over!*—that's what you are.

W. *Done over!*—Gracious God!—how illiberal is this world!—how given to abuse!—I should not have expected such language from a Gentleman!—*Done over!*—

[*Exit Wiltshire Clothier, repeating mournfully to himself—"Done over!"*]

Honest

Honest Tom Coriate, in his Dialogue with the Mahometan, says, very naturally, “ But I “ pray thee tell me, thou *Mabometan*, dost thou “ in sadness call me *Giaur*? That I do, quoth “ he. Then, quoth I, in very sober sadness, I “ retort that shameful word in thy throat, and “ tell thee plainly that I am a *Mussulman*, and “ thou art a *Giaur*.” But in this case Mr. W. has the advantage, for I am sure he has not received as *hard names* as he gave, unless Mr. Malham’s comparing him to a Little Dog, may be thought equal to his comparing the Bishop to a Great Dog. As to the name of Dissenter Done Over, I think it very proper, after Mr. Wansey’s own language; and I can hint to Messrs. —, the magnanimous Defenders of the Rights of Discussion, that if they use such abusive and slanderous language, they, (and perhaps my little Friend, the Quaker, if he does not take care,) may be *done over* also.*

* I should not have inserted this passage, if I had not accidentally met with the following *curious* Epistle:—

“ To Mr. L——d, Printer.

“ Dear L——d,

“ Could you make it convenient to meet Wansey, Fisher, “ and Myself, to DRESS —; if you can, come immediately.”

“ H. J.

“ Jan. 15, 1799, half past 3 o’clock.”

But

But here comes another charge of illiberality: "*I lament,*" says the Author of *Rights*, "*that the Author of the Deplorable Malady of H. W. after declaring that no one can reprobate personal satire more than himself, should use so unwarrantable an expression as farrago of LIES.*" I must confess, that "lies" is a very hard word, and seldom pronounced to "ears polite;" but they say in the proverb, "*Truth is the first thing, and politeness the second.*" I am as great an advocate for good manners and politeness as the Author of *Rights*, or even my little Friend, the Quaker, who, I dare say, would rather have half a dozen bottles of his best English Calcevella broke, than take off his hat to a customer. But to the point: If Mr. Wansey *will be so foolhardy* as to tell me, that "*when I am reading a book quietly by my parlour fire, I am hunting or shooting; that, when I am talking to my wife over a dish of tea, that I am getting drunk, and swearing; that I wear a red coat,*" when for eleven years I have worn nothing but black, as my tailor can testify—I say, if Mr. W. will tell me all these things, which are not true, I think I may be excused if I should cry out, in the language of Old Johnson,

son, "Zounds, Sir, it is a d—d lie! God forgive me for swearing!" In like manner, if I should call a person a disciple of Tom Payne, and say, that he left England for fear of prosecution, and that he was expelled the Society of his Sect—if all these things were *false*, he would, I think, be quite right in saying *I told a lie*.

I agree with the Writer of the "Chapter of Verses," that Ridicule ought not be considered the *test of truth*; but I think in some cases Ridicule is the best weapon, particularly in the case of a noisy nonsensical Clothier, putting on the self-important airs of the most solemn decider in cases of Morality, Religion, and Literature. I can easily account for this extreme shyness about Ridicule. But, Horace says,

Ridiculum acri,
Plenius et melius magnas plerumque fecat res.

In fair discussion it is highly improper; but, in the name of God, who could treat W.'s *rant seriously*? However, to the Verses,—which are written by way of "*Retort courteous*," it seems, to shew, how easily and readily, the "*courteous Retorter*" could himself manage the weapons

pons of Ridicule and Verse! He says, "*As the P. P. of Sarum has taken the liberty of setting up a laugh on one side, he shall be excused RETORTING the laugh!*" He then tells a story about a stone falling upon the head of H.W. on which the Man of wicked Rhymes, the Critic, and two "Jockies" as he most humourously calls them, pronounce him mad, and one puts the comical incident into metre. Now, if any body in this island of Great-Britain, from Harnham-Hill to Johnny Groat's House, in Scotland, can find out any thing to *laugh* at, either in the story or manner of telling it, I only say, I ENVY THAT MAN! always excepting however, the facetious Gentleman who wrote it, and his own friends. I dare say they all laughed heartily.—Who could help it?—Ha! ha! ha!

Now, Mr. Poet, one word with you. I do not like the office of a surly Critic, but as you may possibly be a "young beginner," (I have indeed heard, the Author has written before this divers pretty pieces of "special merit, but of little note,") I shall give all encouragement to rising talents, though at the same time
I take

I take the liberty of pointing out a very trifling fault or two:

“ And *they*, a *lunatic* committee, forsooth,

“ Which assertion mayhap is not far from the truth.”

I was really puzzled how to read the first line, as it did not appear quite so harmonious as the other, till I found the word “ *Lunatic*,” (to make the line scan) should be pronounced *Lunattic*, by which trifling alteration the line goes inimitably smooth:

~ ~ ~ ~ ~
And they a *Lunattic* committee forsooth.

Bravo, Mr. Poet ! “ Pritty well ! pritty well !” as Signior Rauzzini exclaimed, when one of his pupils first warbled in public ! Upon mentioning the word *Lunattic* to a friend, who was a deep reader, and profound scientific, verbal, and syllabic Critic, he informed me he had seen the word in an ancient M. S. He did opine it was compounded of *Luna*, which signifieth the Moon, and *Attic*, an high part of an house, an upper chamber, time out of mind considered a place peculiarly favourable to poetic inspiration, particularly if the candle be out, and the *Moon* shine ! So, in

D

Sam.

Sam. Foote's Comedy, the Poet, with delightful rapture, exclaims,

"PALLAS te hoc vulnere PALLAS, Immolat;"

Upon which the Welshman, who had crept up stairs to peep at the Man of Verse, cries out, "D—n your *Palace*! I wish to God I was out "of your *Garret*!" In such a lofty abode the idea and the word might possibly have been first suggested.

"So pell mell they went to't, like Arab or Turk,
"With his *writings* and *notes* made most horrible work,
"And, swearing they'd leave the *non con* in the lurch,
"Cast *bells* from his *metal*, to call folks to *church*.
"But what at the critic made people to laugh,
"Was his trampling on *wheat*, and his champing the *chaff*:
"And who at his budget could choose but to grin?
"For he threw out the *kernels* and put the *shells* in."

Hazy, hazy, Master Poet! However, I would not discourage you, and I really think in time you may emulate your great countryman, Stephen Duck, provided you pay a little more attention to the quantity of syllables, get a tolerable knack of distinguishing verse from prose, and write in the margin where you would have us laugh.

The

The Gentleman Cit, in Moliere, desires his Master of Rhetoric to write something elegant for him to his Mistress:—"Will you have verse "or prose," enquired the Master of Rhetoric? "Neither *one* nor *t'other*, ni verse, ni prose," answered the grave gentleman: "O, but it *must* "be one or the other, for what is *not* verse, is "prose, and what is not prose, is verse." Now I do conceive, that if this Master of Rhetoric could have seen the verses with which the *Rights of Discussion* are adorned, he would have known that there might be a thing in human composition, which was *ni prose, ni verse*, neither one nor the other.

I fear, if a Church and King mob were to attack this poor Poet, (as they did the inoffensive Philosopher, Dr. Priestley) he would meet with the fate of the unfortunate Cinna, in Shakespeare's Julius Cæsar:—

Third Plebeian. Your name, Sir, truly?

Cinna. Truly, my name is Cinna.

First Pleb. Tear him in pieces, HE'S A CONSPIRATOR.

Cin. I am Cinna the Poet, I am Cinna the Poet.

Fourth Pleb. Tear him for his bad verses, tear him for his bad verses.

“ *This Farce of ludicrously charging an Author
 “ with insanity, whom he could not seriously answer,
 “ was taken from Pope:*” —

Answer. The *Farce* was not taken from Pope, the idea was.—As to the Writer not being able seriously to answer such a Scribbler as Wansey, the observation is rather unfortunate, for it is now, I believe, very well known, that the *Rowland*, which has successfully and fully, and paragraph by paragraph, answered Wansey, was written by one and the same person, as the Author of the *Dissenter Done Over*; I only think, that Wansey's Letter deserved no other reply than *ridicule*. It should be remarked, that the joke was directed against Mr. Wansey's asserting that the Clergy *wore red coats*, and I think, the most charitable construction must be, that he could not be far from being as is described in the *Malady*, when he asserted so ridiculous a falsehood.

C H A P. VI.

And now for a word about *Rowland*.—The Author of *Rights* very fairly gives up the most material points of the question, having like an honourable man readily acknowledged Mr. W.'s illiberality. However, the *Rowland* comes in for a share of censure, as if the Writer of that Pamphlet thought he had a *right* to set up himself as an *infallible* judge; or, as they quote, to “deal damnation round, on each he *judged* a “foe!” If the Author of *Rowland* did set himself up as such a judge, if he *did* “deal damnation” on all he *judged* a foe, no human being ought to say a word in his defence. I shall examine the statements, by and bye, which are adduced in support of this charge. In the *beginning of this Chapter*, the Defender of the Rights of Discussion, says, “*The Author of a “Rowland for an Oliver, must excuse me from “following him into France, or entering into any “defence of Mr. Godwin, or the Correspondent “Society.*” I dare say, the Author of *Rowland* will

will readily excuse him from following him into *France*.—Tender ground, I believe; is it not?

Incedo per ignes
Suppositos cineri doloso.

Whether Mr. Godwin will think “*such idle observations*” worth his notice, *he* must determine; a plain circumstance is stated by *Rowland*, and Mr. Godwin may controvert it or not as he chuses. “*What has France or the London Correspondence to do with the matter?*” A good deal. If *Wansey* disclaims PREJUDICE, and affects to be the sole dictator of TRUTH, it is fair to enquire what he means by PREJUDICE and TRUTH? For as the bloody despots of France, (and the *sagacious philosopher*, who has found out that when men have got rid of their prejudices, they need not *die*) make use of the same language, it is fair to enquire whether *W.* uses the words, *prejudice* and *truth*, in the same sense as they do. It is supposed, however, that the “*idle observations*” about *France*, and the *London Corresponding Society*, might be introduced for the purpose of making out a book, but scantily furnished with better materials. Answer. The materials

terials were enough to confute Mr. Wansey, scanty as they were; and I can hint to the Author of the *Rights of Discussion*, that a good deal of matter in a small compass, is better than a little matter in a large compass; and I can tell him too, that though he has been labouring near a Quarter of a Year to produce the “*great work*” of one hundred and fifty pages; it will take up possibly more time to read it, at least those parts, where the Author presumes to give subjects for Charges. My duty, however, obliged me to go through the Controversial part, but if the book had been *shorter*, and sold for one shilling, instead of half a crown, I should have thrown away *less time* and *less money*.

Μεγα Βιβλίον, µεγα κακον.

The Author of *Rights*, says, “ *I cannot help noticing the Rowland’s presumption, in venturing in a Note to assert, that the religion of the Presbyterians, consisted chiefly in opposition to the Church of England.*” The learned Gentleman ought to be told; that these words are not the words of the Author of *Rowland*, but are in a Note to Gray’s *Hudibras*. Dr. Gray, therefore,
is

is answerable. If it might appear wrong to quote such a Note, I can only say, that as Mr. W. first chose a quotation against the Clergy from that book, it was fair to give him a slice out of the same book; with the Note, by way of make-weight, into the bargain.

Now for the very objectionable paragraph, on account of which, the Author of *Rowland* is accused of "*dealing damnation*" on all "*be judged*" a foe. The paragraph in *Rowland* is this: "*As long as they continue faithful followers of Jesus Christ, and continue peaceable and charitable, they will NOT BE DISTURBED.*" *Disturbed*, seems the word which creates such uneasiness. "*If the menace contained in this paragraph, (it is added) were backed with power,*" Lord have mercy upon the poor Dissenters! To my understanding, the meaning appears simply thus: That so long as the Dissenters continue peaceable, and do not *disturb* the laws, the laws will not disturb them. If they are bold enough to oppose the laws, I trust those laws will be strong enough to restrain and PUNISH them. It is curious to hear people speak with such horror of the word
 "disturb,"

“disturb,” when they talk themselves of destroying the pillars of superstition and tyranny, by which some persons, if they judged with the same liberality as themselves, might perhaps suppose that they meant the Clergy and the King. Though I am very far from thinking so ill of them, yet *should* they be daring enough to attempt this great work, I might just put them in mind of their own Motto, with the application of which they seem peculiarly delighted:

— Nec lex est justior ullâ
Quam necis artifices arte perire suâ.

Apropos ; this quotation puts me in mind of the wonderful cleverness, with which a *Note* of *Rowland* is turned upon himself. *Rowland* says, “ the Philosopher Godwin, who does *not* “ *believe* Revelation, *believes* the *day* will come, “ when men upon earth will enjoy that consum- “ mate perfection, of which, he, and *some other* “ *sublime* natures, are capable. When the glo- “ rious *day* shall arrive, *he believes*, men will “ not eat, or drink, or propagate, or die.”

Now I think to *such* a day, the quotation
from

from that great Philosopher, Tom Thumb,
may with justice be applied :

This day, O Mr. Doodle, is a day
Indeed, a day we never saw before !

Reader, mind the retort keen ;

This *Note* of Mr. Doodle, is a *Note*
Indeed, a Note we never saw before !

There's wit, there's novelty, there's cleverness
for you—

—— O te, Bollane, *cerebri*
Aiebam tacitus !

CHAP. VII.

I should forfeit all pretensions to truth and candour, if I did not join the Author of the *Rights*, in condemning many parts of the Pamphlet, entitled *A Broom*: it is an injudicious attack; the language which is used towards an amiable and venerable man, Mr. Kingsbury, is not to be justified; still less can I speak in favor of that outrageous idea, and the plan which the Author suggests, in
“ making a congregation of Dissenters, where
“ more than forty-nine persons are assembled to-
“ gether,

“gether, amenable to the sedition act, *what-*
“ ever their serious ostensible motive may be.” If
 the Author of *Rights* could have pointed out
 amongst the Clergy in general, such sentiments
 as these, I would have joined heart and hand
 with him, in stepping forward to expose them;
 the majority of the Clergy would not, I am
 sure, avow such sentiments, or defend them.
 Mr. Malham, however, ought to speak for him-
 self, and if he cannot explain what he means,
 satisfactory, he ought fairly and openly to ac-
 knowledge himself in the wrong. The curious
 story about robbing a garden had surely been bet-
 ter omitted; particular failings of any individual
 ought not to affect a whole body; they exaspe-
 rate, without proving any thing. I dare say, my
 little Friend, the Quaker, would think it very
 hard, if he, or any of his persuasion, were
 thought the worse of, on account of the *new*
species of gallantry, which one of that venerable
 body was guilty of at Colchester, according to
 the Ballad of Sir John Dennam;

All in the land of Essex,
 At Colchester the zealous, &c.

Equally blameable is the sentiment in the
Broom, that “ his Lordship’s powers of disci-
 “ mination

“ mination are not *as weak, or wicked*, as those
 “ of some other persons at the trials, that made
 “ so much noise at Maidstone.” These improper and intolerant expressions, the majority of the Clergy would not avow, any more, than the respectable part of the Dissenters would avow Mr. W.’s absurd abuse, and many other intolerant sentiments, avowed by some of their society, against the Church; and, I hope that the Clergy of the Church of England, will not be considered in general, without farther proof, the abettors of tyranny, or the “ *enemies of fair discussion.*” The joke at the end of this Chapter, respecting the dress of the Author of the *Broom*, I do not understand; but if it has any allusion to his situation as Country Curate, without honours or emoluments in the Church, it is unfeeling indeed !

Many parts of the *Broom*, however, deserve commendation; and if “ Mr. W. *deserved* THE
 “ THANKS OF THE PUBLIC *for his good intentions, though he was* INCORRECT in some instances,” the same, I am sure, may be said of the Author of the *Broom*, and with more propriety.

CHAP. VIII.

As I confine myself chiefly to the expression and sentiments of intolerance, whether they come from one side or the other, it is not a part of my plan to enter into the dispute between the Author of the *Appeal*, and the Author of *Rights*, about things which I think subordinate. The *Appeal* is written by a sensible man, and one who is much more able to defend himself, respecting the truth of his propositions, than I could be; *my chief object* is to expose the uncandidness of those who affect peculiarly the spirit of candour; who, whilst they profess to be the *advocates of discussion* seem to be angry at *all discussion*, which affects *their own Creed*; ecce specimen: “ *If the fires of persecution are*
 “ *now to be rekindled, whatever furnace may be*
 “ *beated for conscientious Dissenters of every de-*
 “ *nomination, if the bigots who condemn them to the*
 “ *flames, choose, with Nebuchadnezzar, to gratify*
 “ *their uncharitable feelings with a cool view of*
 “ *the sufferings of such martyrs in the fiery fur-*
 “ *nace,*

*“ nace, I doubt not, but they will find one support-
 “ ing them in every trying ordeal, whose form will
 “ be like the form of the Son of God.”*

In the name of mercy and truth, where is there a shadow of proof to justify such horrible insinuations. Behold the Heroes of the dreadful Drama—the Priests of the Church of England, lighting the fires of persecution;—the Bigots who condemn the *conscientious* Dissenters, gratifying “ their uncharitable feelings, with
 “ the cool view of the sufferings of such mar-
 “ tyrs in the fiery furnace.”

If there be such bigots; if there be such persecutors in any Church, may they reap the just reward of their cruelty, like the servants of the Monarch of the East; and may the Son of Man uphold, support, and reward, the miserable victims of their tyranny!—But to hint, from any thing that has appeared in the present Controversy, that the Clergy of the Church of England partake of the fierce spirit described; that they would light the fires of persecution, and like Bonner, “ brisk as shepherd at a
 “ wake,” enjoy the show, and “ dance about
 “ the

“ the stake,” is a most infamous calumny, and doubly odious in such as affect the language of candour and truth. It is possible I may mistake the meaning;—I hope I do; but, if this language implies, that, in general, the Church of England is so bigoted and intolerant, I should not fear to enter the lists, *against forty times the strength* of the Author of *Rights*, and pledge myself to prove, that from the reformation to the present time, the Clergy have conducted themselves with moderation and liberality, in the true spirit of Christianity; infinitely more than *they* have, who have coolly laid uncharitableness, bigotry, and persecution, to their charge! Compare even THIS INSINUATION AGAINST THE CHURCH, with the “ *uncharitable*” passage which the Author of *Rights* condemns so much in the *Appeal*; what is said in the *Appeal*, is this:—

“ The real object of Dissenters, is not religious,
 “ but political; whatever difference of opinion
 “ may arise amongst them on the subject of religion, they are united in the same inveterate
 “ hatred against regal, as well as episcopal government; and they inculcate sentiments of
 “ sedition and treachery on uneducated minds.”

This

This is a charge too serious to be brought against the Dissenters, in general; it is true, with respect to *some* of them, as I can prove, and as I pledge myself to do. But does the language of the Author of the *Appeal* justify such bitterness of reproof, and unjust exaggeration?—For the conclusion, by the Vindicator of *Rights*, is, “ I cannot but feel with horror, “ that whilst such accusations are urged against “ the Dissenters, with all the bitterness of political and religious bigotry, *if* Dissenters, of “ every denomination, had *but* one neck, a *Nero* “ would not be wanting to strike off their heads “ at one blow !”

So much for Charity, and the Rights of Discussion!

By the sufferers in the “ fiery furnace,” possibly may be meant, the pious and *persecuted Trio*, (Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego) Henry Wansey, clothier; Joseph Fisher, attorney; and Thomas Clio Rickman, stationer. I can tell them, however, before they assume to themselves the name of the “ Children of the “ Living God,” it would not be amiss if they
were

were to put on a little of that humility and charity, the "Son of Man" so emphatically inculcated. As to the "fiery furnace," they need not be *alarmed*, whilst our mild laws exist, which, I hope, they would not rashly oppose, lest by the introduction of anarchy, they might light such a "fiery furnace," indeed, as has been blazing so long in France!

With respect to their violence of language, I may say in the words of Chillingworth, "that passionate expressions, and vehement asseverations are no arguments, unless it be of the weakness of the cause which is defended by them, or the man that defends it." Let it be remembered, that all the *hard words used* against the Clergy, upon this occasion, and all the uncharitable sentiments imputed to them, have been owing solely to their *exercising that right* of discussion, which it seems nobody ought to exercise, but the lamb-like Clothier, the magnanimous Attorney, and the tinckling* Stationer.

* Alluding to Clio's Verses.

CHAP. IX.

ON THE

Vindication of all Dissenters.

“ If we have imbibed,” it is said, “ a religious
 “ persuasion, erroneous or not, which we, in our
 “ consciences, believe to be true, what PRINCE
 “ OR PRELATE HATH A RIGHT TO CHARGE
 “ PENAL LAWS, OR FULMINATE EXCOMMU-
 “ NICATIONS AND SPIRITUAL CENSURES ON
 “ OUR HEADS, FOR THINKING, JUDGING,
 “ AND BELIEVING FOR OURSELVES, *instead of*
 “ pinning our faith upon the sleeves of others?
 “ Perhaps we may be told, that it is not for think-
 “ ing for ourselves, but for promulgating our opi-
 “ nions, that we fall under the lash of the law, or
 “ censures of the church. If we believe the opinions
 “ that we have formed to be of importance to the
 “ happiness of society, here or hereafter, it is our
 “ bounden duty to inculcate them on every occasion;
 “ and any law to restrain us from so doing, or to
 “ compel

“ *compel us to adopt the opinion of others, in mat-
 “ ters of conscience, is treason against the rights of
 “ conscience, and an impious usurpation on the pre-
 “ rogative of Heaven.*”

I agree perfectly, and so I hope the Clergy do, in general, (notwithstanding the outcry attempted to be raised against them) that no person has a right to interfere with another's mode of thinking, or belief. Nor has “any PRELATE, “or PRINCE,” thought, in the present instance, of “fulminating excommunications” against any set of men for believing, according to their conscience: the Author of *Rights*, therefore, has no adversary but his own shadow. When it is said, farther, that every man has a right of promulgating what HE THINKS TO BE TRUE; I answer, I do not deny his *natural* right; but the *society*, of which he is a member, has also a *right* of judging whether his mode of promulgation may, or may not, be subversive of general order and peace. The fair Quaker who went naked into the church, at Deal, no doubt, imagined she was worshipping God in the only proper way, and with her private sentiments upon the matter, no one had a right to interfere; but if by thus

E 2

publicly

publicly promulgating her opinion, she offended the decency, and the general sense of propriety of the majority who thought differently from her, THEY had a RIGHT to restrain her.

But it is said, “ *If* WE BELIEVE *the opinions* “ *we have formed* to BE OF IMPORTANCE to “ *mankind, here or hereafter, it is our* BOUNDEN “ DUTY TO PROMULGATE THEM.” You may think it your duty to promulgate them, but it is the duty of society to see that *your promulgation* of what you *believe* to be *so important*, should not, as I have said before, offend the general sense and established peace of society. Think and believe what you please, but do not interfere with others. Suppose the sect of the Adamites should arise again; if they should attempt to introduce their creed at the expence of decency, propriety, and general morality, under the plea that THEY ALONE JUDGED RIGHT, would not the law be justified in taking care of such disturbers of the peace, as well as prophet Brothers, or George Gordon? The principle assumed, that every man is to *propagate* what HE ALONE THINKS OF IMPORTANCE to *happiness*, here and hereafter, might lead to such sort of preaching as Cowper de-

describes, Wansey's favourite Poet, where "All
 " are loud, all learned, and all drunk: each
 " claiming *truth*, and *truth* disclaiming all."

I have said, under what restrictions such preaching might be allowed, but though the preachers all pretended to TRUTH, (like that great preacher, Anacharsis Clootz,*) they might not themselves be the less exempt from BIGOTRY.

But, says the Defender of the Rights of Discussion, "*Judaism would have remained unshaken, if Christ had submitted to such a law.*"—I answer, let a preacher of whatever doctrine come before the public, come before the world, with

* This extraordinary PREACHER called himself the "Orator of the human Race." He addressed a letter to the National Assembly, beginning with the "ORATOR of the HUMAN RACE, to the Legislators of the HUMAN RACE:" He was of course the infallible JUDGE OF TRUTH, and the enemy of BIGOTRY; he PREACHED *blood* and *slaughter*; he invented the word *Sep-tembriser*, to express without an idea of crime, the act of DESTROYING a defenceless creature, who possibly *was not of the same way of thinking with himself*. He reproached TOM PAYNE with having too many political and religious PREJUDICES! He was condemned by the Revolutionary Tribunal.—He appealed to the HUMAN RACE, whose Orator he had been, but none of his Clients interfered, and this inimitable PREACHER *suffered death!*

Adolphus's Memoirs, v. 1, p. 292.

such

such *credentials* as the Author and Finisher of our Faith, I will implicitly believe, whatever he lays down to be *true*, and shall think myself bound to follow his commands; of others, who have not such clear credentials, I can only say, God forbid we should endeavour to *compel* them to think with *us*, only do not let them, by asserting their EXCLUSIVE PRETENSIONS TO TRUTH, for proof of which I *have only their* ASSERTIONS, assume the right of destroying what they chuse to call prejudice and bigotry: because, I say, the assumption of this right, in any man whatever, is the foundation of all intolerance, bigotry, and bloodshed.

It is said, “ *What are the Protestant doctrines of Christianity, but schisms from the Church of Rome.*” I answer; the corruptions of the Church of Rome were proved, *not by assertion, but by fair demonstration and unanswerable arguments*; the *schism*, therefore, was necessary. Nor does any one pretend to *blame schismatics*, who are actuated by principle and conscience. The considerations which determine you, might not have the same effect upon ME: I therefore say, prove to me, that you have truth
on

on your side, and I will follow your creed; in the mean time, I would wish you to *tolerate me*; and *not*, “because I think differently “from you,” represent me as the enemy of all discussion, and ASSUME THE POINT, that MY creed is the creed of intolerance, usurpation, and bigotry.

What is said about the Rights of Discussion, and that “without such Rights we should not “have had the labours of a Newton,” is nothing to the purpose. The Rights of fair Discussion are not, nor have been, *called in question*; the Clergy in general, I assert, do not call them in question; it is *false* to say the Bishop called them in question; and the passages in the present Controversy, which I have acknowledged improper, are no proofs that the Rights of Discussion are, in general, denied; still less do they justify the language about “destroying the temple of persecution.” If this language means the destroying, *ipso facto*, the existing Church-worship, it is itself the greatest proof of intolerance, pride, and persecution; if it means, that by fair argument, the Dissenters can establish their claim to superior liberality, I deny it.

Upon

Upon the whole, the *Rights* appear to have gone, all along, upon false premises. From one or two passages in the present Controversy, the principle is ASSUMED, that the established Clergy are all enemies to discussion, and that like the ministers of the Kings of Babylon, they would put all who would not bow down and worship the golden image, "into the "DREADFUL FIERY FURNACE;" they are then warned to *take care* lest they get "SCORCHED "themselves."

Whilst Dissenters beg the question, that the Clergy are like the ministers of the tyrants of the East; possibly, if it were in their power, they would not hesitate to *inflict the* PUNISHMENT which they think such bloody Ministers deserve. But I trust the time is not yet come, and I appeal to the plain sense of mankind, *whose* language and conduct, upon this occasion, is most like the language of *intolerance* and *persecution*!

It may be said, that the Clergy are not accused absolutely of being intolerant and bloody; it is only said, "If *the fires of persecution*," &c. "If
" *the*

"the Bigots who condemn to flames," &c. To which I answer, the *general impression* excited by these passages, is, that the Clergy have now shewn themselves *intolerant* and *oppressive*; otherwise all that is said in the *Rights* is nothing to the purpose.

I do not wish to deny the Rights of Discussion. I only say, do not let any one judge *me*, for not believing what "*he thinks to be true*," unless he can PROVE it to be so; when he has done this, it will be time enough to appeal to his HUMANITY, should he come armed, cap-a-pee to destroy the Monster "*Superstition*." Now, a proposition to claim my assent, must be either *self-evident*, or PROPOUNDED by such *authority*, as I cannot but admit, as in the case of our Saviour; or else it must be *demonstrated* by such arguments, as I cannot controvert; as in the case of Chillingworth, against the *corruptions* of the Church of Rome; but that *truth* is against *us*, is not *self-evident*, nor is *your assertion* any authority that it is so, nor have you attempted to *demonstrate* it by any arguments which I cannot controvert. Therefore, I would have you PAUSE a little, before you proceed so violently against what you are pleased to term
super-

superstition and prejudice. Remember also, that to require, I should *admit* THAT TO BE TRUTH, which is proved only by the IPSE DIXIT of a person, possibly not *wiser* or *better* than myself, is the first step towards prejudice and bigotry, be it on one side, or the other.

The fair statement of the whole of the present Controversy, is this:—Mr. Wansey, after ASSUMING *a point of* DISCUSSION, discusses it; but with an illiberality and vulgarity, that is acknowledged by all; yet, says the Author of *Rights*, “ *he* DESERVES THE THANKS OF THE “ PUBLIC.” The Clergy discuss Mr. W.’s discussion, and, from one or two sentiments, (nothing like so illiberal and intolerant as his own) which some of his Opponents have expressed, the Clergy are considered as fanatic, bigoted, and bloody; and it is pretended what great service will accrue to the cause of TRUTH and HUMANITY, when Priestley persecution is swept away. The very foundation of all that is said in the *Rights of Discussion* is, as I have said, FALSE, and I defy any one to prove it otherwise; the book proceeds upon the ASSUMPTION, that the Bishop *denied* the *rights* of Controversy, WHICH
THE

THE BISHOP NEVER DID! I sincerely wish the Dissenters, *upon some charges*, had more *able vindicators*, though I am glad of any thing that can be urged in their defence, nor would I appear in opposition farther than where *themselves* seem *intolerant*. As to the “*unprescriptible, unalienable Rights*,” which are so strenuously insisted on, I do not deny to any one such Rights; but I think we ought not to lay implicit reliance upon mere words, in the momentous cause of humanity and mercy, as precisely the same language has been used by those who have trampled upon every sanction of HUMAN JUSTICE, and every suggestion of HUMAN MERCY!

The subjects for Charges, THEY may examine, who chuse to read them, nor shall I say any thing of the ingenious specimens of poetry, by which they are accompanied. Possibly, when the Pamphlet of *Rights*, like a great Battleship, came sailing down the stream of Controversy, Mr. Thomas Clio Rickman might have sighed,

O let my little bark attendant sail,
Pursue the triumph, and partake the gale.

Nor shall I farther interrupt the triumph either of Thomas, or his friends.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

In return for the Author of *Rights*' kindness in informing us what subjects HE thinks most *proper* for Visitation Charges, I might point out a few subjects for the pen of the Author of *Deplorable Malady*, &c.

1st. The Dragon of Superstition, a Drama, in imitation of the *Great Dragon of Wantley*—shewing how this terrible Dragon was assailed by a Clothier, a Lawyer, and a Stationer: the first, armed with a *Spinning-Jenny*; the second, with a writ of “*Capias*,” and the third, a “*Poor Robin's Almanack*,” with his own verses in frontispiece.

2d. *Wansley*, a Pastoral, to the tune of

Despairing beside a clear stream
A *Clothier* forsaken was laid,
And whilst *Church* and *King* were his theme,
A *Jenny* supported his head ; &c.

3d. An Heroic Epistle from Peedy-weedy, the noted Chimney-sweeper, to the redoubted Author of *Rights*.

Since

Since these Sheets were sent to Press, I have been favoured with an Explanation of the obnoxious passage in the *Broom*, which I publish, in justice to the Author :

“ What the Author of *Rights* has said about
 “ Mr. Pitt’s Sedition Act, is equally perverted,
 “ as his other assertions. When men can pro-
 “ cure a licence for sixpence or a shilling, or
 “ whatever trivial sum it may be, can any
 “ thing less than consummate pertinacity per-
 “ severe in setting defiance to the laws? or can
 “ the grievance possibly be any other than ideal,
 “ which can be removed at so easy a rate? For
 “ my part, at the same time that I disavow all
 “ and every species of real persecution, I should
 “ wish to see those licences subject to a consider-
 “ able stamp duty, that they might be made
 “ serviceable to the necessities of the state.

“ But the Country Curate’s mind on the Se-
 “ dition Act, seems to be better known to the
 “ Author of *Rights of Discussion*, than to him-
 “ self. I think his language must have this con-
 “ struction.

"struction. The pretended design or inter-
 "tion 'to turn it into an engine of religious per-
 "secution against all Dissenting congregations,
 "where more than forty-nine persons are
 "assembled,' is as gross an instance of pervers-
 "sion as hitherto has occurred. It is stated
 "in the note, at p. 49, of which he gives only
 "the latter part, as in his opinion most vul-
 "nerable, especially when detached from the
 "former part, that they are amenable to the pe-
 "nal parts of this statute, if they are not 'le-
 "gally convened, according to the directions
 "of that act.' But if they have a licensed
 "place of worship, where religious duties, on
 "public occasions, are performed by a licensed
 "Preacher or Preachers, the directions of that
 "act are virtually complied with, and this hor-
 "rible engine is disarmed of its dreaded pow-
 "ers. What, then, becomes of the bugbear
 "he has raised, to prejudice the public mind
 "against the Author of the *Broom*, whose
 "pamphlet he is examining? We may per-
 "tinently retort upon him his own words, and
 "exclaim, 'O horrible! most horrible!'

It should be mentioned also, that when Mr. M.
 stated he had no emoluments in the Church,
 it

it was in opposition to what Mr. Wansey had insinuated respecting the Vicar of Scarborough, that his "own vicarage" was the reason of his strenuous support of "all that was dear."

The Author of *Rights* affects to despise ridicule; but after his own pointless, unmanly, and pitiful jokes, about Mr. M.; which are called "DRESSING;" he must excuse my POSTSCRIPT, &c.

I decline entering on the subject of the Political conduct of Dissenters in general: there are many respectable and worthy men among them, and for their sake I shall make no further observations on the language of some of their Preachers; or the principles of hostility to Church and State, which most of their eminent writers, Priestley, Price, Kippis, &c. have AVOWED. Dr. Rees ought to be mentioned with the utmost respect.

F I N I S.

ERRATA.

- Page 1, line 7, for *some*, read *other*.
 — 2, — 14, for *wilfully*, read *ignorantly*.
 — 7, — 2, for *of himself*, read *himself*.
 — 8, — 10, for *Draw-cancer*, read *Drawcansir*.
 — 11, — 16, for *Bastwich*, read *Bastwick*.
 — 13, — 7, for *never*, read *ever*.
 — 19, — 12, for *aeri*, read *acri*.
 — 30, — 20, dele *that*.
 — 32, — 7, dele *and*.

* See "REHEARSAL," Act V.

Drawcansir:

"Let petty Kings the name of Party know,
 "Where'er I come I slay both FRIEND and FOE."

Upon which *Bays* says, very justly,

"There's a *brave* fellow for you now, Sirs. You may talk of
 "your *Heffors*, &c. but I defy all your Histories, and Romances
 "too, to shew me one such conqueror as this DRAWCANSIR."

